



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:					
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments	Attachment
17.		Favor	Genevieve M Clavreul		No
			Laura Shumate	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in the undercut resources that truly contribute to unwell communities - like housing, voluntary health care, jobs, even healthy foods and community grounds that encourage pride in a neighborhood. Lets support people before the courts. Court-focused solutions are the old behaviors that have gotten us to where we are today and we have too many cases and studies that show us that it's the lack of resources first that create the reasons we see individuals forced into the court system. Los Angeles overwhelmingly asked for a change in 2020 with Measure J, so let's do it.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services</p>	No

As of: 3/14/2022 2:58:53 PM



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Mary Kay K Holman-Romero	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mary Kay Holman-Romero mkholmanromero@gmail.com</p>	
Paolo Beltran	<p>The City of Lakewood supports the motion by Supervisors Hahn and Barger to support Governor Newsom's CARE Court Proposal. Although the full details of the plan are still being worked out, the proposed CARE Court appears to offer a much-needed tool to provide mental health treatment, substance use treatment, and housing to those individuals who are most vulnerable and in need. Los Angeles County (including Lakewood) stands to benefit greatly from the rollout of the CARE Court. Individuals with untreated severe mental illness and/or substance use disorders too often end up on the streets as part of the 66,000 unhoused population, in the County jails as part of the 5,700 Mental Health Population, or in the County hospitals with ailments that have been exacerbated by neglect. None of these outcomes provide the care and treatment that these individuals need. For these reasons, the City of Lakewood supports this motion. Mayor Jeff Wood on behalf of the Lakewood City Council.</p>	No
Ruby Condon	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

			<p>reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in systems of community care, such as affordable housing, mental health care, public education, etc.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	<b>Oppose</b>	Alex Fierro-Clarke	I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up	<b>No</b>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Allen Martsch	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Amelie Cherlin	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.	
Annalise C Lamberty	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in affordable housing initiatives, rent control, voluntary rehabilitation programs and defunding the militarized LAPD.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Annedell Walker	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in community based prevention and voluntary treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Anthony Arenas	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I personally believe that what your constituents really need is relief that does not come in the form of involuntary treatment, which we know doesn't work. I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Ashley Brim	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in community based programs that allow the individual in question to have the support they need in a non-carceral environment. Recovery is an ongoing, truly lifelong, process and it never works if it is imposed on an individual against their will.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Ashley Locke	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in actual community-based treatments and provide housing.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Barbara N Lago	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Beth Baker	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in more options for serving the needs of people with mental health issues proactively, so that they do not worsen.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Casey D Otto	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people. Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness.</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Catherine Safley	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in localized, voluntary mental health treatment programs and facilities that are trauma-informed and culturally competent. The County should also invest deeply in more localized, voluntary, trauma-informed and culturally competent addiction treatment and universal medical care, as physical and mental health care are deeply linked. The County should invest in free permanent housing for Angelenos who are currently unhoused enabling individuals and families in need to live in currently existing houses and apartments rather than the carceral, wasteful, isolating "tiny homes" that are an inhumane and ineffective solution to the need for housing and leave numerous vacant houses and apartments sitting empty. The County should fund universal basic income for all Angelenos with income under \$50K a year, with more robust payments for those who are unhoused, unemployed and or disabled. There are so many excellent options for providing care and safety in our communities, and none of them involve denying vulnerable people their core rights and freedoms.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court Framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support, including permanent supportive housing, for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>The proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	chris R cohen	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>[Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in mental health treatment for people who want it. It shouldn't be imposed on people like a punishment once they've had problems with the law, it should be there for people BEFORE they run into problems.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	CHRIS R RIDDLE	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in mental health services that meet people where they are, and work with the community to support those suffering from mental illness by working with them, rather than by force. Healing is an individual choice, and therefore the consent of the individuals suffering must be at the center of the treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Cordelia Arterian	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Darcy Laparra	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in making health care more accessible to everyone, from</p>	No



## PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

### Correspondence Received

	<p>trusted community groups and stakeholders.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Dawy Rkasuam	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>Instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in housing, health care, counseling services, and other VOLUNTARY treatment options that will help people heal, while protecting their human rights and dignity.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Diana D Arterian	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Elise Kalfayan	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Elise Piatkowski	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach and when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in preventative care, voluntary care, housing and community</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

			<p>based care.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Elizabeth S Logsdon	I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.	No	



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Erica Hendry	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Geoffrey Golden	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in voluntary treatment programs and supportive services, such as funding for public housing, job training, education, and treatment centers.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Gizella Czene	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Gregory M Irwin	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Herley Jim Bowling	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Jack MacCarthy	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework — a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care.</p> <p>The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment. Involuntary treatment is simply incarceration by another name.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p> <p>Thank you, Jack MacCarthy, your constituent</p>	
Jewell Karinen	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework. This policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years.</p> <p>The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

communities, and stakeholders, Justice LA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.

I personally believe that ordering people into involuntary treatment is inhumane. It also seems obvious that it will be ineffective and costly. The county should use those dollars to instead invest in community organizations that support and protect unhoused people, and organizations that provide child care, addiction recovery, and mental health services to members of the community. We need to be funding our communities at every level.

I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.

However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.

California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services. Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.

The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	necessary services accessible to all.	
Joan Harper	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in services in the community that meet these needs. There are far too many of them and so people think involuntary treatment is the right and only option. Meet people where they are and get them the services they need.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Jordan Harari	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in better infrastructure for mental health.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Jordan Riggs	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Julia Haft-Candell	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in mental healthcare as a human right.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Julia Koerber	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Julia S Novis	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Kevin Kearney		No
Kevin King	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in harm reduction, housing and employment opportunities, and voluntary treatment proven to support those who are struggling with mental and behavioral needs.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARE Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services</p> <p>Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Kristina Lear	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>This proposal is too close to jails by another name and we know what that looks like and the disastrous results it brings. Especially in that it further others the people these things say they are built to help. So, lets do something else.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Laura Shumate	<p>This is my OPPOSE position. I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in the what we all know too well with studies and cases that under-resourced neighborhoods are what create crime as a solution for individuals. Instead of a court-focused solution, let's start with a people's first solution that is different from the decades that haven't worked so far as we are still here. Furthermore, Los Angeles residents overwhelmingly asked for a care-first, incarceration-last solution, so let's get to it.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for</p>	No



## PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

### Correspondence Received

	<p>mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Lauren Kinsler	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Lauren Worsham	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people. California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Lucy Rimalower	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in community-based mental health resources such as Support Groups, Harm Reduction Clinics and Crisis Hotlines.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both homelessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Mario C Batres	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment. Involuntary treatment is just another way to further ostracize and already marginalized community that needs our support, not open derision.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Melissa Butts	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in community programs that support all citizens before they get to the point where they need treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Melissa Manousos	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally I believe that instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in optional mental health, substance abuse, and other health programs. Making these types of care programs available to all who want them at any time would be far more powerful and useful than requiring them for folks who are seeking support while experiencing homelessness.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of homelessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Michelle King	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing homelessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>[Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in harm reduction, housing and employment opportunities, and voluntary treatment proven to support those who are struggling with mental and behavioral needs.</p>	No





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services</p> <p>Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Rachel Rosenbloom	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to</p>	No



## PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

### Correspondence Received

	<p>the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in housing and services that give folks permanent and consistent solutions to their ongoing struggles.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Rebecca Himmelstein	I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

		<p>systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
	Samantha Lappin	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.

Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in housing and food programs, providing access to basic needs that so many folks in our community don't have, though our community is filled with many who have unlimited access and resources. Spend money on care, not control.

I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.

However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.

California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services  
Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.

The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.

Sarah Bowers

I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up

No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.

I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.

However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.

California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services  
Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.

The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.

Selina Ho

I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up

No



## PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

### Correspondence Received

to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.

Personally, instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, the County should invest in increasing access to free/affordable mental health care that is community-based and tackling the systemic issues that are often at the root of the struggles people with mental health needs are facing.

I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.

However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.

California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services  
Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.

The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.





**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

## MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

## Correspondence Received

Sherry Varon	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	No
--------------	--	----



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

Sophia Rome	<p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	No
Stephen Brantley	<p>I am writing as a formerly unhoused person in recovery from opioid addiction to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework. EVERYONE I EVER KNEW WHO OVERDOSED AND DIED DID SO AFTER RELEASED FROM MANDATORY CONFINED TREATMENT OR JAIL. Every single one.</p> <p>This policy proposal would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years, but what we need is more access to VOLUNTARY treatment programs, harm reduction, housing and employment opportunities. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from</p>	No



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.

I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.

However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.

California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services  
Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.

The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.

Suzanne Boretz

I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework—a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based

No



## PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

### Correspondence Received

	<p>systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.</p> <p>Personally, I see this proposal as a way of blaming those most visibly in need of consistent mental healthcare – our unhoused neighbors – for their needs. Instead of ordering people into involuntary treatment, I think the County should invest in permanent affordable housing and a network of other supportive services that all contribute to health: primary healthcare, healthy food access, job training, financial literacy, and of course, mental healthcare.</p> <p>I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.</p> <p>However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.</p> <p>California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.</p> <p>The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other necessary services accessible to all.</p>	
Tara Gardner	I am writing to express my opposition to Governor Newsom's CARE Court Framework —a policy proposal that would authorize civil-court judges to order	No



## PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
SHEILA KUEHL  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

### Correspondence Received

an individual to involuntarily undergo mental or behavioral health care for up to two years. In partnership with grassroots organizations, advocates, directly impacted communities, and stakeholders, JLA works to reduce the footprint of incarceration by stopping jail expansion and reclaiming, reimagining and reinvesting dollars away from incarceration and into community-based systems of care. The initial proposal for CARE Court has our community deeply concerned. Far too often do we see legal overreach when it comes to the mental health care of individuals experiencing houselessness and serious mental health issues. Our communities need direct investment in robust medical and mental health care, not court-ordered treatment.

I urge the Board to reject the CARE Court framework as it stands right now. I believe the Board is capable of furthering a more holistic, rights-respecting approach to addressing both houselessness and mental and behavioral health needs. I support significantly increasing the availability of evidence-based voluntary treatment and other needed support (including permanent supportive housing) for people who struggle with mental and behavioral health needs, as most people who want such treatment in the United States are unable to access it.

However, the proposed CARES Court framework does not require consent for processing through the new system. Rather, individuals are referred for mandatory participation, thus removing their choice to consent to medical care. This framework runs directly counter to the principle of free and informed consent to mental health treatment, which is a cornerstone of the right to health. Conflating health treatment and forced participation, as envisioned by the CARE Court Framework, risks substantial human and civil rights abuse, is ineffective as a treatment, and takes resources and policy focus away from initiatives that are much more likely to help people.

#### California Should Invest in Voluntary Treatment and Supportive Services

Forcing medications and potentially conservatorships onto the most vulnerable Californians is not the answer to the crisis of houselessness. Without addressing the need for housing and ongoing services, it is highly likely that coerced treatment will perpetuate the revolving door of incarceration and lack of meaningful support. California would more effectively address these problems by providing affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, voluntary services, and health care, instead of spending resources on a forced court-based intervention in the name of treatment.

The CARE Courts is a plan for expanded civil-legal power under the guise of treatment. I ask that you reject this potentially harmful and abusive program and, instead, direct resources towards making voluntary treatment and other

				necessary services accessible to all.	
		Item Total	60		
Grand Total			60		